

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE: STEVEN WAYNE BONILLA

No. 2:23-cv-02728-TLN-KJN
No. 2:23-cv-02729-TLN-KJN
No. 2:23-cv-02873-TLN-KJN
No. 2:23-cv-02874-TLN-KJN
No. 2:23-cv-02875-TLN-KJN
No. 2:23-cv-02876-TLN-KJN
No. 2:23-cv-02877-TLN-KJN
No. 2:23-cv-02878-TLN-KJN
No. 2:23-cv-02891-TLN-KJN
No. 2:23-cv-02920-TLN-KJN

ORDER

Plaintiff Steven Wayne Bonilla is a state prisoner proceeding without counsel in the above-captioned civil actions. On November 29, 2018, the Court declared Plaintiff a vexatious litigant and ordered the Clerk of the Court not to file or assign a civil case number to any proposed habeas corpus petition or civil action related to Plaintiff's criminal conviction in Alameda County. (*See Bonilla v. Fresno County*, Case No. 2:18-cv-2544-TLN-KJN, ECF No.


1 13). On June 14, 2023, the Court modified its vexatious litigant Order and directed the Clerk of
2 the Court to open a new case for each attempted new case pleading and assign it to the
3 undersigned and Magistrate Judge Kendall J. Newman. (*Id.* at ECF No. 26). If the Court
4 determines the new filing is related to Plaintiff's Alameda County criminal conviction, the case
5 will be ordered dismissed and closed. (*Id.*)

6 The Court has reviewed the complaints/petitions filed in the above-captioned cases and
7 finds they are related to Plaintiff's Alameda County criminal conviction.¹

8 Accordingly, the complaints/petitions in Case Nos. 2:23-cv-02728, 2:23-cv-02729, 2:23-
9 cv-02873, 2:23-cv-02874, 2:23-cv-02875, 2:23-cv-02876, 2:23-cv-02877, 2:23-cv-02878, 2:23-
10 cv-02891 and 2:23-cv-02920 are hereby DISMISSED. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close
11 these cases. No further filings will be accepted.

12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Dated: January 10, 2024



14
15
16
17

Troy L. Nunley
United States District Judge

25
26 ¹ Plaintiff erroneously names the Tehama County Superior Court in the caption of Case No.
27 2:23-cv-2875. To the extent Plaintiff intended to file that complaint/petition in the United States
28 District Court for the Eastern District of California, the Court finds that the claims raised therein
are related to his Alameda County criminal conviction and are therefore dismissed pursuant to the
modified vexatious litigant Order.